Appl. No. 10/660,292
Response to 1st Action dated 11/27/2006
Reply to Office Action of 08/25/2006

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9 and 13 – 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sengstack. Claims 4 – 6, 10 – 12 and 16 – 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sengstack in view of Neubert et al.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 to overcome the 102 rejection made thereto. No new matter has been added to the Application since support for the rejection can be found on page 6, line 31 to page 7, line 3 and page 9, lines 8 – 11.

By this amendment, Claims 1 – 18 remain pending in the Application. For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claims 1 and 5 are illustrative.

> 1. A method of authoring digitized audio/video recordings comprising:
> *previewing an audio/video data recording to identify scenes to be included in a first version of the recording and scenes to be included in a second version of the recording, the first version and second version of the recording being different from each other and having at least one scene in common, a scene being a group of contiguous video frames;*
> identifying the scenes to be included in the first version and the second version of the recording;
> *selecting a title by which to identify the first version and the second version of the recording; and*
> *associating the scenes to be included in the first version with the selected title of the first version of the recording and scenes to be included in the second version with the selected title of the second version of the recording.* (Emphasis added.)

Applicants submit that the claims, as presently drafted, are allowable over the applied references.

AUS920030222US1

Page 6 of 8

Appl. No. 10/660,292
Response to 1ˢᵗ Action dated 11/27/2006
Reply to Office Action of 08/25/2006

Sengstack purports to teach a method by which a user may transfer a recorded video clip from a camcorder to a computer system using ADOBE Premiere 6.5. In accordance with the teachings of Sengstack, if a camcorder is set to VTR/VCR and the capture movie window of the ADOBE Premiere 6.5 is opened, a user may click file and select Capture, Movie Capture. Once there, the user may start playing a recorded movie from the camcorder to find a video clip that is to be transferred to the computer system. To transfer the video clip, a "begin" frame and an "end" frame of the video clip have to first be identified in the recorded movie and specified in the ADOBE Premiere 6.5. When the "begin" frame is identified in the recorded movie and specified in ADOBE Premiere 6.5, the camcorder is synchronized with the ADOBE Premiere 6.5 by using a timecode. As the recorded movie continues to play in order to identify the "end" frame, the length of the video clip is being recorded. Then using the "begin" frame and the length of the video clip, ADOBE Premiere 6.5 will download the video clip from the camcorder to the computer system. Once the clip has been downloaded, ADOBE Premiere 6.5 will prompt the user to name the video clip.

But note that it is one scene (i.e., a group of contiguous video frames) that are downloaded. Thus, Sengstack does not teach the steps of naming first and second versions of a video clip wherein the first and second versions have one scene in common with each other. Specifically Sengstack does not teach, show or suggest the steps of *previewing an audio/video data recording to identify scenes to be included in a first version of the recording and scenes to be included in a second version of the recording, the first version and second version of the recording being different from each other and having at least one scene in common, a scene being a group of contiguous video frames; selecting a title by which to identify the first version and the second version of the recording; and associating the scenes to be included in the first version with the selected title of the first version of the recording and scenes to be included in the second version with the selected title of the second version of the recording.*

AUS920030222US1

Page 7 of 8

Appl. No. 10/660,292
Response to 1st Action dated 11/27/2006
Reply to Office Action of 08/25/2006

Since Sengstack does not teach the emboldened-italicized limitations in
the above-reproduced Claim 1 and since Neubert et al. is used to show the use
of an emulator to preview a recording, Applicants submit that Claim 1 and its
dependent claims are allowable. The other independent claims (i.e., Claims 7
and 13) along with their dependent claims which all include the emboldened-
italicized limitations of Claim are allowable as well. Consequently, Applicants
once more respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue
of the claims in the application.

Respectfully Submitted

By: _____
Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969

AUS920030222US1

Page 8 of 8